



REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL SOLICITATION INSTRUCTIONS – Instruction to Offerors (ITO)

Title: SOCOM WIDE MISSION SUPPORT (SWMS) GROUP-A J5 FPS SME Support Services

Task Order Number: ID04190132
Issuance Date: **22 Oct 19**
Closing Date: **12 Nov 19 4:00 PM ET**
Questions Due: **29 Oct 19 by 4:00 PM ET**
NAICS Code: 541611
Order Type: Firm Fixed Price with Labor Hour and Cost Reimbursement – No Fee

This is a Task Order Request for Proposal (RFP) and this document constitutes the only solicitation. This acquisition is being conducted in accordance with the fair opportunity procedures at FAR 16.505(b). This solicitation is released to SOCOM WIDE MISSION SUPPORT (SWMS) GROUP-A competitive multiple-award Indefinite Delivery, Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) holding contracts as of the date of this RFP. This is NOT a FAR Part 15 negotiated competition. The Government intends to award a hybrid-type task order, incorporating a mix of Firm Fixed Price (FFP), Labor Hours (LH) and Cost Reimbursement – No Fee (CRNF) pricing arrangements in accordance with the attached Statement of Work (SOW).

In order to submit a proposal in response to this RFP, offerors must hold a SWMS Group A Contract. Offerors shall ensure that their proposals are in compliance with the required SWMS Group A contract. Any interested SWMS Group A contract holders may participate in this acquisition by submitting a proposal in accordance with the instructions set forth in this document. Failure to comply with any and/or all of the instructions in this document may result in the offeror's proposal not being considered for award.

Questions regarding this solicitation must be submitted in writing via email to the below identified issuing office points of contact no later than the aforementioned date and time. **Please note that neither telephone nor facsimile inquiries will be accepted.** The only method by which any term of this solicitation may be modified is by a formal amendment to the RFP generated by the issuing office. No other communications, whether oral or in writing, will modify or supersede the terms of this solicitation document. The Government reserves the right to deny any questions, including questions received after the aforementioned date and time. Note - All correspondence shall include the GSA Contract ID in the subject title.

Offerors are directed not to contact SOCOM or any other GSA personnel or other Government employees regarding this procurement, other than the individual(s) identified below without the prior approval of Jason R. Miller, GSA Senior Contracting Officer.

ISSUING OFFICE

Jason R. Miller, Senior Contracting Officer (CO)

Jason.Miller@gsa.gov

GSA/FAS/AASD (4Q)

77 Forsythe Street, SW

Atlanta, GA 30308

Jason Crockett, Contract Specialist (CS)

Jason.Crockett@gsa.gov

GSA/FAS/AASD (4Q)

77 Forsythe Street, SW

Atlanta, GA 30308

PROPOSAL SUBMISSION PROCEDURES

Proposals shall be submitted by November 12, 2019 at 4:00 pm ET via GSA's web-based procurement system, AAS Business Systems Portal (AASBS Portal), formerly IT-Solutions Shop (ITSS), [web address: <https://portal.fas.gsa.gov>]. Proposals submitted by electronic commerce as designated by this solicitation shall be considered only if the offeror uses the specific electronic commerce method stipulated by the solicitation. Submission by any other method shall result in rejection of the entire proposal.

If you have not already registered in the AASBS Portal, contact the AASBS registration desk at 877-472-4877 to complete your registration. DO NOT WAIT UNTIL THE LAST MINUTE TO CHECK TO SEE IF YOUR FIRM, CONTRACT NUMBER, AND INDIVIDUAL AUTHORIZED TO SUBMIT PROPOSAL(S) ARE CORRECTLY REGISTERED IN AASBS. If you experience any difficulties with AASBS during proposal submission, you should alert the AASBS technical support and the GSA Issuing Office point of contact without delay.

Offeror must also be registered within the System for Award Management (SAM) [<https://www.sam.gov/portal/SAM/>]. An award cannot be made if the information in AASBS Portal does not exactly match with the information in the SAM. AASBS verifies the following data with the SAM:

- Legal Business Name
- Doing Business As (DBA)
- Physical Address
- Remittance Address
- Federal Tax ID (Employer's identification Number)
- DUNS (Data Universal numbering System)

Proposal must include confirmation of current SAM registration.

The Contracting Officer has determined that the **SWMS Group A competitive pool** is applicable to this task order. Offerors shall ensure proposals submitted in response to this RFP are compliant with this determination and the terms of this solicitation.

Proposals shall set forth full, accurate, and complete information as required by this RFP package (including attachments). The penalty for making false statements in an offeror's proposal is prescribed in 18 U.S.C. 1001.

PROPOSAL FORMAT AND INSTRUCTIONS

All information shall be submitted in English. Each offeror must submit a proposal consisting of written information in strict accordance with these instructions. Proposals that do not follow these Instructions, or otherwise include documentation that is difficult to read, may result in disqualification.

It is not desirable for the offeror to simply restate or rephrase the Government's SOW requirements; similarly, for example, it is not desirable for the offeror to generically state the offeror's capability, approach, etc., to all solicitations for services. Rather, the offeror's proposal is expected to contain sufficient details and correspond to the specific requirements in this SOW as applicable under the respective evaluation criteria below. An offeror's failure to provide adequate details may result in exclusion from further award consideration or the Government assigning levels of weakness, thus increased risk, to the offeror's proposal. Offerors shall assume that the Government has no prior knowledge of their skills and experience, and will base its evaluation on the information presented within the offeror's proposal.

While the Government's evaluation team will strive for maximum objectivity, the best value process, by its nature, is subjective; and therefore, professional judgment is implicit throughout the entire process.

To ensure that a proposal is evaluated completely and given the full consideration to which it is entitled, it must be submitted in the format described below:

Proposals shall be submitted electronically to the AASBS Portal [web address: <https://portal.fas.gsa.gov>] under RFP number ID04190132 in one of the following file formats: Microsoft Word document (.doc or .docx file), Microsoft Excel document (.xls or .xlsx file), or searchable Portable Document Format (.pdf file).

The written Technical Proposal shall be submitted in an 8-1/2" x 11" format with 12-point Times New Roman font with 1-inch margins and shall not exceed 20 single sided pages in a Microsoft Word (.doc) or Adobe (.pdf) file format. All pages beyond the 20th page of the proposal will not be evaluated.

All proposal development costs shall be borne by the offerors without reimbursement from GSA.

Proposals consist of and shall include the following proposal documents with the page limits as specified:

- EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (1 page limitation)
- VOLUME 1: Evaluation Factor A: Technical Approach (20 page limitation)
- VOLUME 2: Evaluation Factor B: Price Factor Proposal (Offeror Pricing Spreadsheet)
- Copy of completed Contract Teaming Arrangement (CTA), if applicable

Note: Volumes shall not be combined. A table of contents and index do not count toward the page total. The Reps and Certs information listed on page 12 of this document that the offeror is requested to fill out and return, do not count against the page total. The Offeror's proposal shall provide evidence that it agrees to hold the terms and conditions of their proposal available for a minimum of 120 calendar days after submission.

The offer shall include the Company Name, Company Point of Contact to include Name, Mailing Address, E-Mail Address, Fax Number and Phone Number.

Volume 1: Technical Approach

The written Technical Proposal shall be submitted in an 8-1/2" x 11" format with 12-point font with all pages numbered and shall be single sided pages in a Microsoft Word (.doc) or Adobe (.pdf) file format. The total page count of the offeror's responses for Volume I: Technical Approach shall not exceed 20 pages. Any pages submitted beyond that will not be evaluated. All proposal references shall be linked/tied, in writing/by reference, to the specific paragraph in the SOW to which they pertain.

Technical factors will be evaluated by a Government Technical Evaluation Panel having broad familiarity with the requirements of this acquisition. Proposals will be evaluated to determine the relative merits of the offeror's proposal, in accordance with evaluation criteria set forth below. The offeror shall then be given a combined technical/risk rating for Factor A. Each subfactor evaluation criteria shall not receive an independent rating. The proposal should fully address each of the evaluation criteria. The Government shall assign an overall technical rating to the results of its evaluation.

Volume 2 Price Factor

Price Proposal shall be submitted using the Government-provided format presented in the proposal pricing matrix document (SOW Attachment 1).

The pricing template is in Microsoft Excel format with 4 sheets for the offers completion of price related information and assumptions. Additional information may be added, but additions or modifications to formulas must be clearly indicated with comments.

Pricing information relative to the proposal shall only be included in the Proposal Volume II. Do not place any pricing information in Volume I.

Offerors are advised that the Government anticipates award of a hybrid-type task order resulting from this solicitation, incorporating a mix of Firm Fixed Price (FFP), Labor Hour (LH) and Cost Reimbursement – No Fee (CRNF) pricing arrangements. Contract Line Item Numbers (CLINs)/task items will be established as the pricing arrangements listed below. Basic CLINs will be denoted as 0001, 0005 and 0006. Optional line items will carry the same pricing type, and will be denoted as 1001, 2001, 3001, 4001, etc., indicating the option year in the first digit. Offerors are requested to prepare their proposals accordingly. The hours provided in the pricing spreadsheet are the required hours for this task. Offerors may not deviate from the labor mix or level of effort (LOE) identified in the proposal pricing matrix spreadsheet. Offerors may add and include short price related description/narrative notes in the Template if needed.

CLIN/task item

0001 – Firm Fixed Price (FFP) LABOR

0005 – Cost Reimbursement No Fee (CRNF) TRAVEL

0006 – Labor Hour (LH) SURGE LABOR

*Please review the separately attached Statement of Work (SOW).

BASIS FOR AWARD

This acquisition will be conducted in accordance with the fair opportunity procedures at FAR 16.505(b), under the SOCOM Wide Mission Support (SWMS) Group-A.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

Award will be made to the responsible offeror demonstrating the best value to the Government. Best value is defined as the expected outcome of an acquisition that, in the Government's estimation, provides the greatest overall benefit in response to the requirement. The best value will be determined by comparing differences in the value of non-price features with differences in cost to the Government. In making this comparison, **the Government is more concerned with obtaining superior non-price features than with making an award at the lowest overall price to the Government.** However, the Government will not make an award at a significantly higher overall price to achieve slightly superior non-price features. As the difference in non-price proposals become smaller, then price becomes more important.

In other words, price is not expected to be the controlling factor in the selection of a Contractor for this proposal. However, the degree of importance of price as a factor could become greater depending upon the equality of the proposals for other factors evaluated. Where competing proposals are determined to be substantially equal after evaluation of all non-price factors, the total price and other price factors could become the controlling factor.

The following factors will be used to evaluate all offers. The technical evaluation factor is significantly more important than price.

Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, such as terms and conditions, required representations and certifications, as well as technical requirements to be eligible for award. Offerors shall specifically identify and address assumptions, deviations and exceptions within their proposal. Full explanation and justification of assumptions, deviations and exceptions must be provided. If no assumptions, deviations or exceptions are taken to the solicitation terms and conditions, a statement to that effect is required. Offerors are cautioned that failure to submit the items required by the RFP, and also that any deviations or exceptions taken to the terms or conditions of the solicitation, including submission of an alternate proposal that relaxes or changes a requirement of the solicitation, may make a proposal unacceptable and ineligible for award if an opportunity to revise proposals is not granted, unless the solicitation expressly authorizes such an exception with regard to that specific term or condition.

The Government intends to evaluate the proposal and may award a task order without further conferring sessions with offerors (except communications conducted for the purpose of minor clarification). The Government reserves the right to confer with an offeror to clear up proposal

details if necessary in the Government's discretion. The Government may award a task order without such confer sessions. Therefore, each initial offer should contain the offeror's best terms from a price and technical standpoint. The Government reserves the right to make no award. The Government reserves the right to reject any proposal that includes any assumption/exception that adversely impacts the Government's requirements.

If an offeror fails to submit any of the required information as stated in this RFP, they will be considered not eligible and will be eliminated from award consideration. The failure of a proposal to meet all of the requirements under any factor may result in the Government determining it as a weakness.

The Government reserves the right to request revised proposals if needed.

The Government intends to conduct a source selection process in accordance with FAR Part 16.505 and all applicable supplements for orders under IDIQ contracts. Formal Source Selection procedures, in accordance with FAR Part 15, will not be used. Accordingly, the Government is not obligated to determine a competitive range, conduct discussions with all Offerors, solicit final revised proposals, and use other techniques associated with FAR part 15. If after the evaluation of proposals under the non-price and price factors the CO determines that the number of proposals that would otherwise be competitive from a best value standpoint exceeds the number at which an efficient competition can be conducted, the CO will limit the number of proposals to be considered to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition among those proposals most likely to be determined best value and will enter into confer sessions with that subset of offerors whose proposals are considered most likely to provide best value if the Government determines them to be in the Government's best interests.

Post-Selection Negotiations: This is a task order award utilizing the streamlined procedures of 16.505(b) wherein the Contracting Officer may exercise broad discretion in developing appropriate order placement procedures. Accordingly, also reserved to the Government is the right for the Contracting Officer, at the conclusion of the evaluation process and after the Contracting Officer has determined the Government's proposed best value awardee but prior to award, to negotiate exclusively with that proposed awardee on all aspects of that Offeror's proposal that the Contracting Officer deems appropriate, including but not limited to negotiating changes to specific proposal terms, in order to finalize terms of the order for award. If the Contracting Officer is unable to negotiate with that Offeror to terms agreeable to the Government, then the Contracting Officer reserves the right to negotiate similarly with the Offeror that was next-in-line to be the proposed best value awardee; this process may continue with the Offerors that submitted proposals until an award is made, or until a decision is made to reopen negotiations with all Offerors, or until the Contracting Officer determines to make no award. Post-selection negotiations, if any, with the proposed best value awardee shall not constitute a competitive range determination and shall not otherwise entitle other Offerors, if any, to an opportunity to revise proposals.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

The following evaluation factors, in descending order of importance, will be used to evaluate all proposals:

Evaluation Factor A: Volume 1: Technical Approach*
Subfactor One: Staffing Approach

Subfactor Two: Management Approach**Subfactor Three: Experience****Subfactor Four: Transition Approach**

*** All sub-factors are of equal importance.**

Evaluation Factor B: Volume 2: Price**A. General Procedures**

Offerors' technical proposals shall be evaluated for merit, using the adjectival evaluation criteria contained in Factor A, Technical Approach, below for scoring purposes. The technical evaluation will be conducted by a Government Technical Evaluation Panel.

Offerors' proposed prices shall be considered but will not of themselves be given any specific ratings. Price analysis shall be performed on all price data provided by offerors to assess the reasonableness of the proposed prices.

B. Factor A: Technical Approach

Technical Approach will be evaluated by a Government Technical Evaluation Panel having broad familiarity with the requirements of this acquisition. Proposals will be evaluated to determine the relative merits of the offeror's proposal, in accordance with evaluation criteria set forth below. Specifically, the Technical Approach assessment represents the evaluation of Staffing Approach, Management Approach, Experience and Transition Approach as an indicator of the probability of successfully performing as proposed. Technical Approach will receive an overall adjectival rating based on the ratings of all the technical subfactors combined. The proposal should fully address each of the evaluation criteria. The Government shall assign a rating to the results of its evaluation.

The technical evaluation criteria are as follows:

Subfactor One: Staffing Approach

In this section of the technical approach, the offeror shall:

- Detail their approach and ability to recruit, hire, and retain (minimize turnover), replace and train qualified personnel who can operate in the J5 environment throughout the life of the task order.
- Provide an overall staffing approach that will reduce turnover and maintain high quality services.
- Clearly describe their process (including a timeline) for replacement of personnel due to turnover, retirement, etc. which shall be updated in the Service Delivery Summary (SDS).

Method of Evaluation

The Government will evaluate the degree to which the offeror's proposal includes methods to successfully recruit, retain, hire, replace and train a capable workforce to ensure all requirements

of the solicitation are met and that the workforce possesses the skills required to operate in a collaborative intelligence fusion environment as follows.

- a. Consideration of the degree to which the staffing approach proposes innovations to minimize and reduce task order turnover and provide a benefit to the Government.
- b. Consideration of the degree to which the staffing approach adequately addresses the offeror's process for determining a candidate contractor employee's understanding of the J5 FPS Support mission as identified in the SOW.
- c. Consideration of the degree to which the offeror describes an adequate approach to ensuring quality and timely delivery of services, to include filling position shortfalls and meeting surge capabilities.
- d. Consideration of the degree to which the offeror's proposed personnel replacement timelines meet or exceed the Acceptable Quality Levels outlined in the SDS.

Subfactor Two: Management Approach

In this section of the technical approach, the offeror shall:

- Provide a clear and comprehensive description of its management approach and proposed resources to execute the J5 FPS SME Support Services task order.
- Describe their approach for management of surge capability, and position shortfalls.

Method of Evaluation

The Government will evaluate the degree to which the offeror's task order management approach demonstrates a sound, practical methodology for satisfying the requirements of the SOW as follows:

- a. The degree to which the offeror's approach demonstrates an overall understanding of all the requirements in the SOW, and how it relates to the successful management of task order requirements. Offeror is not required to address each section of the SOW, but must demonstrate an overall understanding.
- b. The degree to which the offeror's proposed management structure satisfies quality control purposes.
- c. The degree to which the offeror's proposed structure successfully handles quality control within the Directorate of Operations IAW the SOW required priorities.
- d. The degree to which the offeror describes an adequate approach for management of surge capability and position shortfalls.

Subfactor Three: Experience

In this section of the technical approach, the offeror shall provide a description at the Unclassified Level of their experience providing multifunctional/multidiscipline teams to Operations Directorates and Theater Special Operations Commands and other Operational units within the USSOCOM Enterprise.

Method of Evaluation

The Government will evaluate the offeror's experience in providing multidiscipline teams to Operations Centers within the USSOCOM enterprise.

- a. The degree to which the offeror demonstrates experience of successfully providing personnel with qualifications described in the SOW.
- b. The degree to which the offeror demonstrates experience of successfully providing teams that consist of the positions and qualifications described in the SOW.

Subfactor Four: Transition Approach

In this section of the technical approach, the offeror shall:

- Describe their overall management approach for transition, including the ability to meet the timelines required in the SOW and SDS.
- Include a transition timeline from task order award to full operating capacity (all personnel in required locations/place of duty in full performance of requirements).
- Detail the plan for task order personnel until they are within the filled positions.

Method of Evaluation

The Government will evaluate the adequacy of the proposed approach and methodology to transition from the current task order to the new task order.

- a. Extent to which the offeror ensures that fully qualified personnel are in place to support the task order in compliance with the SOW and SDS timelines.
- b. The Degree to which the offeror minimizes interruptions or delays to work in progress that would impact the mission.
- c. The sufficiency of the offeror's plan for the transfer of work control, delineating the method for processing and assigning tasks during the phase-in/phase-out periods.

Ratings: For the Technical Approach, the ratings utilized for evaluating are defined as follows:

RATING	DESCRIPTION
High Confidence (HC)	Evaluation of the factor leaves <u>virtually no doubt</u> that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Little or no Government oversight is expected to be required in achieving the required level of performance.
Significant Confidence (SC)	Evaluation of the factor leaves <u>little doubt</u> that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Minimal Government oversight is expected to be required in achieving the proposed level of performance.
Medium Confidence (MC)	Evaluation of the factor leaves <u>some doubt</u> that the offeror can successfully perform the required effort, however it is believed that there is a high probability that the offeror can perform successfully. Some Government oversight is expected to be required to meet the contract requirements.
Little Confidence (LC)	Evaluation of the factor leaves <u>substantial doubt</u> that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Substantial Government oversight or intervention is expected to be required in achieving the proposed level of performance. Changes in the offeror's existing processes may be necessary to achieve contract

RATING	DESCRIPTION
	requirements.
No Confidence (NC)	Evaluation of the factor leaves <u>extreme doubt</u> that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort, regardless of the degree of Government oversight.

C. Factor B: Price: The proposed price will be evaluated for reasonableness. For evaluation purposes only, the total evaluated price/cost is the sum of the total price/cost submitted for the base period, all option periods and a 6-month extension of services period. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

In determining the total price reasonableness, the Government will consider the level of effort and the mix of labor proposed to perform the task order requirements; the total proposed price will be evaluated.

The price portion of the proposal should include skill mix, number of hours per skill, labor rate and associated discounted labor rate, travel, and any other direct costs.

The Government may determine that a proposal is unacceptable if the option costs are significantly unbalanced. Evaluation of options shall not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

UNBALANCED PRICING: In accordance with FAR Clause 52.215-1(f)(8), "Instructions to Offeror-Competitive Acquisition", The Government may determine that a proposal is unacceptable if the prices proposed are materially unbalanced between Contract Line Item Numbers (CLINs) or sub line items (SubCLINs). Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable total evaluated price, the price of one or more CLIN/SubCLIN is significantly overstated or understated as indicated by the application of cost or price analysis techniques. A proposal may be rejected if the Contracting Officer determines that the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government.

ADEQUATE PRICE COMPETITION: Adequate price competition may not be the sole evaluating factor in determining price reasonableness.

The contractor must use the provided Attachment 1, "Pricing Template" (in Excel format) as a basis for delivery of the price proposal for submission to GSA. Offerors may add and include short price related description/narrative notes in the Template if needed.

PAST PERFORMANCE INFORMATION (POST-AWARD)

The Government will provide and record Past Performance Information for acquisitions over \$250,000 utilizing the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS). The CPARS process allows Contractors to view and comment on the Government's evaluation of the Contractor's performance before it is finalized. Contractors are required to register in the CPARS, so contractors may review and comment on past performance reports submitted through the CPARS. The CPARS website is <https://www.cpars.gov>.

SOLICITATION PROVISIONS

The offeror is cautioned that the listed provisions may include blocks that must be completed by the offeror and submitted with its quotation or offer. In lieu of submitting the full text of those provisions, the offeror may identify the provision by paragraph identifier and provide the appropriate information with its quotation or offer. Also, the full text of a solicitation provision may be accessed electronically at this/these address(es): www.acquisition.gov/far/.

NUMBER	TITLE	DATE
FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION (48 CFR Chapter 1)		
52.204-24	Representation Regarding Certain Telecommunications and Video Surveillance Services or Equipment	AUG 2019
252.215-7010	Requirements for Certified Cost or Pricing Data and Data Other Than Certified Cost or Pricing Data	JUL 2019
252.215-7007	Notice of Intent to Resolicit	JUN 2012
252.215-7008	ONLY ONE OFFER	OCT 2013

52.232-18 -- Availability of Funds (Apr 1984)

Funds are not presently available for this contract. The Government's obligation under this contract is contingent upon the availability of appropriated funds from which payment for contract purposes can be made. No legal liability on the part of the Government for any payment may arise until funds are made available to the Contracting Officer for this contract and until the Contractor receives notice of such availability, to be confirmed in writing by the Contracting Officer.

52.216-1 -- Type of Contract (Apr 1984)

The Government contemplates award of a Firm Fixed Price with Labor Hour and Cost Reimbursement – No Fee task order resulting from this solicitation.

52.217-5 -- Evaluation of Options (Jul 1990)

Except when it is determined in accordance with FAR 17.206(b) not to be in the Government's best interests, the Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

(End of Provision)

(b) If the Government exercises this option, the extended contract shall be considered to include this option clause.

(c) The total duration of this contract, including the exercise of any options under this clause, shall not exceed 5 (five) years.

(End of Clause)

DFARS 252.209-7999 -- Representation by Corporations Regarding Unpaid Delinquent Tax Liability of Felony Conviction under any Federal Law (Jan 2012)

(a) In accordance with sections 8124 and 8125 of Division A of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012, (Pub. L. 112-74) none of the funds made available by that Act may be used to enter into a contract any corporation that –

(1) Has any unpaid Federal tax liability that has been assessed, for which all judicial and administrative remedies have been exhausted or have lapsed, and that is not being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement with the authority responsible for collecting the tax liability, where the awarding agency is aware of the unpaid tax liability, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and made a determination that this further action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

(2) Was convicted of a felony criminal violation under any Federal law within the preceding 24 months, where the awarding agency is aware of the conviction, unless the agency has considered suspension or debarment of the corporation and made a determination that this action is not necessary to protect the interests of the Government.

(b) The Offeror represents that-

(1) It is [] is not [] a corporation that has any unpaid Federal tax liability that has been assessed, for which all judicial and administrative remedies have been exhausted or have lapsed, and that is not being paid in a timely manner pursuant to an agreement with the authority responsible for collecting the tax liability,

(2) It is [] is not [] a corporation that was convicted of a felony criminal violation under a federal law within the preceding 24 months.

(End of Clause)

Identification of Potential Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI)

FAR Part 9.501 defines OCI as a situation where because of other relationships or activities a person (company) is unable or potentially unable to render impartial assistance or advice to the Government or cannot objectively perform contract work or has an unfair competitive advantage. FAR 9.502 states that “an organizational conflict of interest may result when factors create an actual or potential conflict of interest on an instant contract, or when the nature of the work to be performed on the instant contract creates an actual or potential conflict of interest on a future acquisition.” An OCI exists when the nature of the work to be performed may, without some restriction on future activities, (1) result in an unfair competitive advantage to the contractor on other contracts or (2) impair the contractor’s objectivity in performing the contract work. The primary burden is on the contractor to identify any OCI, however, the Government has the responsibility to identify and evaluate such conflicts.

Task order awardee **MUST** identify any actual or potential OCIs both prior to submitting the proposal and throughout the life of the task order.

-----END OF REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) -----